REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were presented for examination. Claims 3 and 5 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected. The claims, as amended, are listed herein. Claim 8 has been added. No claims have been deleted. Thus, claims 1, 2 and 6-8 remain pending.

Applicant requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

A. Written Description and Enablement

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 112, paragraph 1, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements.

Specifically, with regard to claim 1, Examiner alleged that the original disclosure does not describe or enable "first/ second applications displayed in first/ second windows." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The disclosure describes multiple types of applications being displayed, such as Adobe Reader (e.g., see p. 18, ll. 17) and motion picture playback software (e.g., see p. 19, ll. 3). Additionally, the disclosure describes multiple windows being displayed (e.g., see p. 12, ln. 16; p. 13, ll. 13-15; and p. 6, ll. 4-5). Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement the invention as recited with first and second applications, and first and second widows.

With regard to claim 6, Examiner claims that the original disclosure does not describe or enable "word processing application, spreadsheet application, and image processing application" within the disclosure. In response, Applicants submits that word processor applications are disclosed (e.g., see p. 20, ll. 3-4) and image processing software is described (e.g., see p. 21, ln. 12; and p. 20, ln. 10). Moreover, one or ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement the invention as recited with a word process, spreadsheet and image processing application.

B. Indefiniteness

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention.

In particular, Examiner alleged that two interpretations could be given to the phrase "a display brightness of the display unit." In response, Applicant has amended the phrase to recite "a screen display brightness of the display unit" to clarify that the brightness level refers to the overall screen itself.

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were further rejected for insufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to correct the errors.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Megied et al. (US Patent No. 6,556,253 B1)(Megied). Furthermore, claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kidder (US Patent No. 5,822,599 A).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Megied generally discloses in a mutli-window arrangement, calculating a light output attributable to each window, and, when exceeding a predetermined threshold, automatically reducing the light output (Abstract).

Kidder discloses exclusively activating pixels in an active area of a computer display when a computer system is operating in a power management mode (Abstract).

However, Megied and Kidder each fails to teach or disclose the invention as recited in claim 1, as amended, because of the reasons stated below. Therefore, amended claim 1, and all related claims, are patentable over Megied and Kidder.

Megied And Kidder Both Fail To Disclose A Brightness Adjuster Adjusting A Display Brightness Of A Display Unit According To A Type Of Application Of A Second Application

Amended claim 1 recites a brightness adjuster adjusting a display brightness of a display unit according to a type of application of a second application. The amendment is supported by the original disclosure (e.g., see p. 19 ln. 20-p. 20, ln. 2)

Whereas Megied may disclose adjusting brightness in a window, claim 1 recites adjusting brightness in a window based on a type of application displayed in the window. As a result, different applications can receive different treatment, and have a more optimal display brightness for the type of application (e.g., word processing application treated differently from a image processing application). On the other hand, Megied appears to treat each application the same. Thus, Megied fails to teach or disclose the application based brightness adjustment of claim 1. Similarly, Kidder fails to teach or disclose the same limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to Megied.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious by Megied in view of Kidder.

As discussed above, neither Megied nor Kidder disclose application based control of brightness. As a result, a combination of both references also fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, and all related claims, are patentable over a combination of Megied and Kidder as well.

New Claim 8

New claim 8 includes limitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Thus, no new matter has been added. Also, claim 8 is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

August 5, 2009

/Dorian Cartwright/
Dorian Cartwright
Reg. No. 53,853

Customer Number 54161
(650) 493-4540 telephone
(650) 493-4549 fax